



**PRESENT:**

Dr. Edgar V. Wallin, Chairman  
Mr. J. Dale Patton, Vice-Chairman  
Dr. William P. Brown  
Mr. Russell J. Gulley  
Mr. Reuben J. Waller, Jr.  
Mr. Kirkland A. Turner, Secretary to the Commission,  
Planning Director

**ALSO PRESENT:**

Ms. Bonnie L. Perdue, Clerk to the Commission,  
Plans and Information Section, Planning Department  
Ms. Stacy Taffer, Administrative Manager,  
Plans and Information Section, Planning Department  
Ms. Tara McGee, Assistant County Attorney,  
County Attorney's Office  
Ms. Jane Peterson, Planning and Special Projects Manager,  
Development Review Section, Planning Department  
Ms. Darla Orr, Planning and Special Projects Manager,  
Development Review Section, Planning Department  
Ms. Teresa C. Davis, Planning and Special Projects Coordinator,  
Development Review Section, Planning Department  
Mr. Jesse Smith, Director,  
Transportation Department  
Mr. Bill Wright, Assistant Director,  
Utilities Department  
Mr. Randy Phelps, Principal Engineer,  
Utilities Department  
Mr. Dave Wolverton, Microcomputer Analyst  
Information Systems Technology  
Firefighter Greg Smith, Fire and Life Safety,  
Fire and EMS Department

**6:00 P.M. PUBLIC HEARING.**

**I. INVOCATION.**

Dr. Wallin presented the invocation.

**II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG OF UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.**

The Commission led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

Providing a FIRST CHOICE community through excellence in public service

**III. REVIEW AGENDAS FOR UPCOMING MONTHS.**

Mr. Kirk Turner advised it was not necessary to review agendas and moved to the next agenda item.

**IV. REQUESTS TO POSTPONE ACTION, EMERGENCY ADDITIONS OR CHANGES IN THE ORDER OF PRESENTATION.**

There were no requests to postpone action, emergency additions or changes in the order of presentation.

**V. REVIEW MEETING PROCEDURES.**

Mr. Kirk Turner reviewed the meeting procedures.

**VI. CITIZENS' COMMENT ON UNSCHEDULED MATTERS.**

There were no citizen comments on unscheduled matters.

**VII. PUBLIC HEARING.**

• **CONSENT ITEMS – REZONING AND CONDITIONAL USE PLANNED DEVELOPMENT.**

- B. 13SN0537:** In Midlothian Magisterial District, **Katherine D. Knabe** requests rezoning from Agricultural (A) to Community Business (C-3) with conditional use planned development to permit exceptions to ordinance requirements and amendment of zoning district map on 2.9 acres located in the northwest corner of Midlothian Turnpike and Winterfield Road. Density will be controlled by zoning conditions or ordinance standards. The Comprehensive Plan suggests the property is appropriate for Village Fringe Area and Village Area uses. Tax ID 725-709-7211.

Mr. Garry Gallagher, the applicant's representative, accepted staff's recommendation.

Dr. Wallin opened the floor for public comments.

Mr. Al Myer, resident of Salisbury, expressed the importance of median beautification in the Midlothian Village area and suggested median enhancements to Winterfield Road.

The applicant's representative, Mr. Gallagher advised the median will be attractive.

There being no one else to speak, Dr. Wallin closed the public hearing.

In response to a question by Mr. Waller relative to the median, Mr. Jesse Smith, advised that VDOT must approve alternate designs during the construction stage, to include the use of decorative pavers, as well as maintenance responsibilities for materials other than VDOT standard concrete.

Mr. Waller advised staff has worked diligently to put this case together which includes elements from the adjacent Doran case. The Home Owners Associations from Salisbury, Winterfield Station, Queens Mill, and Rosemont all support this project. He agreed that the median should be enhanced given the anticipated development at this corner.

On motion of Mr. Waller, seconded by Mr. Gulley, the Commission resolved to recommend approval of Case 13SN0537 subject to the following proffered conditions:

PROFFERED CONDITIONS

1. Master Plan: The Textual Statement last revised February 4, 2014 shall be considered the Master Plan. (P)
2. Timbering Restriction: Timber management, for the purpose of enhancing the health and viability of the forest, shall occur under the supervision of a qualified Forester, and will only be allowed upon the submission and approval of the appropriate forest management plan to include, but not limited to, erosion control, Chesapeake Bay Act/wetland restrictions, and the issuance of a land disturbance permit by the Environmental Engineering Department. Any other timbering shall be incorporated into the site development erosion and sediment control plan/narrative as the initial phase of infrastructure construction and will not commence until the issuance of the actual site development land disturbance permit. (EE)
3. Burning Ban: The developer shall not use burning to clear or timber the subject property. (EE)
4. Uses: Except for the uses listed below, which shall be prohibited, permitted uses shall be use permitted by right, or with restrictions, in the Community Business (C-3) District:
  - a. Alternative Financial Institutions
  - b. Cocktail Lounges or Nightclubs
  - c. Coin Laundry
  - d. Commercial Kennels
  - e. Communication towers
  - f. Fraternal Uses
  - g. Feed, seed and ice sales
  - h. Funeral Home or Mortuary
  - i. Gasoline Sales
  - j. Halfway Houses
  - k. Home Centers
  - l. Hospitals
  - m. Hotels
  - n. Indoor or Outdoor Flea Markets
  - o. Material reclamation and recycling centers
  - p. Motor Vehicle Sales, Service, Repair and Rental, including Motor Vehicle Consignment lots
  - q. Motor Vehicle Wash
  - r. Outside Public Address systems
  - s. Park and ride lots
  - t. Tattoo Parlors
  - u. Taxidermies
  - v. Theaters, including drive-in
  - w. Veterinary Hospital with outside runs (P)

5. Hours of Operation: Hours of operation shall be limited to between the hours of 5:00 a.m. and midnight. (P)
6. Dedication: Prior to any site plan approval, or within ninety (90) days of a written request by the Transportation Department, whichever occurs first, thirty-five (35) feet of right-of-way, measured from the centerline of Winterfield Road shall be dedicated, free and unrestricted, to and for the benefit of Chesterfield County. (T)
7. Access:
  - a. Direct vehicular access from the property to Midlothian Turnpike (Route 60) shall be limited to one (1) entrance/exit, generally located towards the western property line, and shall be limited to right-turns-in and right-turns-out only. The exact location of this access shall be approved by the Transportation Department.
  - b. Direct vehicular access from the property to Winterfield Road shall be limited to one (1) entrance/exit, generally located towards the northern property line, and shall be limited to right-turns-in and right-turns-out only. The exact location of this access shall be approved by the Transportation Department.
  - c. Prior to final site plan approval, an access easement, acceptable to the Transportation Department, shall be recorded from the Route 60 and/or Winterfield Road to the adjacent properties. (T)
8. Road Improvements: Prior to issuance of an occupancy permit on the property, the developer shall be responsible for the following road improvements. If any road improvement described herein is provided by others at the time of site plan approval, then such road improvement(s) shall be deemed satisfied. The exact design and length of the improvements shall be approved by the Transportation Department:
  - a. Construction of an additional lane of pavement along the westbound lanes of Route 60 for the entire length of the property frontage;
  - b. Construction of additional pavement along the westbound lanes of Route 60 and along the southbound lanes of Winterfield Road at the approved accesses to provide separate right turn lanes;
  - c. Extension of the Winterfield Road southbound right turn lane at the Route 60/Winterfield Road/Le Gordon Drive intersection to provide an adequate right turn lane;
  - d. Construction of a raised median within Winterfield Road from the Route 60/Winterfield Road/Le Gordon Drive

intersection to the Winterfield Road roundabout to preclude left turns at the property access;

- e. Construction of a sidewalk along the property's frontage to Route 60 and Winterfield Road;
- f. Full cost of traffic signal modifications at the Route 60/Winterfield Road/Le Gordon Drive intersection, as determined by the Transportation Department; and,
- g. Dedication to Chesterfield County, free and unrestricted, of any additional right-of-way (or easements) required for the improvements identified above. (T)

9. Architectural treatment: Unless deviations are approved by the Planning Commission during site plan review, the architectural treatment of the buildings shall be compatible and consistent with Exhibit B, entitled Design Guidelines For Winterfield Village a Mixed Use Development, as approved with Case 03SN0316, and dated January 15, 2004. The following shall also be required:

- a. Buildings shall incorporate equal four sided architecture such that no building exterior (whether front, side or rear) shall consist of inferior materials or be inferior in quality, appearance or detail to any other exterior of the same building.
- b. Vertical architectural façade features shall be continued a minimum of ten (10) feet in depth from the building facade.
- c. Each entrance shall be accentuated with architectural features to include, but not limited to, structured overhangs and/or awnings.
- d. All building mounted lighting shall be compatible with the overall architectural style.
- e. The color palette shall be limited to neutral and earth-toned colors, unless otherwise approved by the Planning Department at the time of plans review.
- f. Drive-in windows shall be screened to reduce visibility of the drive-in windows from public streets. This screening shall be accomplished by building design, the use of durable architectural walls or fences constructed of materials and with a design comparable to the principle building, and berms or other land forms. Such screening shall be approved by the Planning Department in conjunction with plan approval.

- g. Building facades shall be designed such as to create the appearance of multiple, traditional storefronts. Facades facing Winterfield Road and Midlothian Turnpike shall incorporate storefront windows, and other architectural treatments, and landscaping in order to provide relief to such facades. (P)
10. Site Layout: The site shall be designed as generally depicted on Exhibit A, as prepared by Architects Dayton and Thompson, and dated November 8, 2013; however, the exact location of the buildings and parking may be modified, as approved by the Planning Department, provided the general intent of the plan is maintained with respect to buildings “fronting” Midlothian Turnpike and Winterfield Road, with no parking or driveways between the buildings and the roads. (P)
11. Internal Sidewalks: The project shall incorporate an internal system of five (5) feet wide sidewalks, which shall provide internal pedestrian access between uses, and shall connect to the sidewalks along Winterfield Road and Midlothian Turnpike, as well as to the adjacent properties to the north and west. These pedestrian areas/walks shall:
  - a. Be constructed of stamped concrete or other decorative paving units.
  - b. Include pedestrian style lights, and
  - c. Incorporate benches, landscaped areas, plazas, and other pedestrian elements. The exact design shall be approved by the Planning Department at the time of site plan review. (P)
12. External Lighting: Lighting along the perimeter of the development adjacent to Winterfield Road and Midlothian Turnpike shall be of a pedestrian scale. Light fixtures shall be installed with a design consistent with the Midlothian Village Guidelines and spaced as may be approved by the Planning Department at time of site plan review. The project shall also have an internal system of outdoor lighting consistent with the pedestrian scale of the development, as approved by the Planning Department at time of site plan review. (P)
13. Parking Lot Lighting: Parking lot lighting shall be shall be limited to a maximum of twenty (20) feet in height. All light poles and fixtures shall be ornamental and shall be approved by the Planning Department at the time of site plan review. (P)
14. Dumpster Service: Dumpster service shall not be allowed between 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. (P)

AYES: Messrs: Wallin, Patton, Brown, Gulley and Waller.

• **REZONING AND CONDITIONAL USE PLANNED DEVELOPMENT – OTHER.**

- A. **14SN0517\***: In Clover Hill Magisterial District, **Joni Roberts** requests conditional use to permit a family day-care home and amendment of zoning district map in a Residential (R-7) District on .2 acre

known as 13304 Farm Crest Court. Density will be controlled by zoning conditions or ordinance standards. The Comprehensive Plan suggests the property is appropriate for Suburban Residential I use (maximum of 2.0 dwellings per acre). Tax ID 731-678-9030

Mr. Ryan Ramsey presented an overview of the request and staff's recommendation for approval noting as conditioned, the family day care home is compatible with surrounding residential developments. The applicant has been operating a State licensed, family day care home at this address for seventeen (17) years. Approval of this request will permit the applicant to keep a maximum of twelve (12) children at any one time, excluding the applicant's children and any children that reside in the home, for a period of five (5) years from the date of approval, and two (2) employees other than family members that live in the home. The applicant requests she be provided the flexibility to operate the facility without a restriction on the hours and days of operation to accommodate parents that work shift work. The applicant offers a fenced back yard and and proposes no alterations to the existing home for this use.

Ms. Joni Roberts, the applicant, agrees with the conditions. Ms. Roberts advised she has lived at this residence for twenty (20) years and has operated a licensed day care home for eighteen (18) years. She explained that she opened her home to protect, nurture, educate, and teach the gospel truth to children in a Christian environment. She is the mother of five (5) grown children, some of whom work in her day care home. She has the only State licensed day care home in Brandermill and possibly one of the only twenty-four (24) hour day care homes in Chesterfield County. In 1996, an assessment was conducted concerning the current and projected needs for off-hour day care concluding that there was a critical need for off-hour care for those in the roles of police, fire, nursing and retail. Social Services began to actively recruit day care providers in Chesterfield County to accommodate this need. In 1996, she met with Social Services and began an evening, weekend and overnight program for child care in their home. There are many day care and off-hour care providers, some unlicensed and unmonitored. Her day care services children that are special needs, those with severe allergies and those that cannot flourish in larger, more commercial day care environments. In addition, her service also accommodates families by allowing siblings to stay together. Ms. Roberts has received grants from Virginia Tech, Virginia State and the Virginia Cooperative Extension. Currently there are several unlicensed day care homes and many home based businesses in Brandermill. In eleven (11) years, Brandermill has not questioned their existence. Those businesses are not being targeted by the Brandermill Home Owners Association. The Brandermill HOA sent out a survey with three (3) of the five (5) questions being about her specific home day care business. Ms. Roberts requests the Commission approve her case and support her home day care.

Dr. Wallin explained the rules pertaining to the time allowed for speakers and the stop light box.

Ms. Georgia Cole, supports the conditional use permit for Ms. Roberts and has children in her care. While her children are there, she is confident they are well cared for, learn how to work and play with others, and are in a supportive and thriving environment.

Mr. John Bailey, serves as the Community Manager for the Brandermill Home Owners Association. The Brandermill Board has tasked him with making a statement to the Commission. The Brandermill Community Association Board of Directors voted on January 6, 2014 to table the matter of Ms. Roberts' request of support for a conditional use permit until such time that the BCA can survey the community membership regarding support for amending the covenants and set standards for traffic and other issues relating to the enforcement of that portion of the covenants. The covenants state that all lots in the residential areas shall be used for residential purposes exclusively. The use of a portion of a dwelling on a lot as an office by the owner or a tenant thereof, shall be considered a

residential use if such use does not create customer or client traffic to or from the lot. A survey of Brandermill property owners was taken from January 28 through February 14, 2014. Of the 3,950 surveys sent out to the property owners in Brandermill, 1,250 or 32% were returned. The first question asked if the home owner supported the operation of a State licensed and regulated at home day care for more than five (5) but not more than twelve (12) children at any one time, including some that may stay overnight and on the weekends in the residential neighborhoods of Brandermill. The results were 59% voted against and 41% voted in favor of the question and the Planning Commission has been provided a copy of that survey. The Board will meet on March 3, 2014 to consider the results of the survey and to reconsider Ms. Roberts' request for support for a conditional use permit.

Ms. Sharon Veatch, executive director for Child Care Aware of Virginia spoke about the impact of zoning on licensed family child care, noting that licensed child care providers are being driven out of business or are operating as unregulated child care providers due to zoning regulation fees and red tape associated with the process. Her organization supports licensed child care providers offering a base line of basic health and safety guidance for the programs that providers must meet in Virginia.

Rev. Mark A. Devines supports the Roberts' family and appreciates the fact that this home day care is licensed and has operated without incident. He lives across the street and has never seen a traffic problem.

Ms. Kara Ritter supports Ms. Roberts' request and has three (3) daughters in her care who experience a supportive, educational and loving environment while she works. She indicated concerns with the Brandermill survey relative to its receipt and method of return.

Mr. Donald Blom, member of the Brandermill Community Association and Board of Directors stated he was the Board member who made the motion to table Ms. Roberts' case at the last Brandermill Board meeting. Speaking solely on his own behalf, he supports the request. The Brandermill Board has not met to consider the results of the survey and the survey should not be considered in the case. Mr. Blom feels the wording of the survey was slanted against Ms. Roberts and if the survey had been worded differently, it would have yielded a different result.

Ms. Francis Hillman, a director from the Brandermill Board does not support any twenty-four (24) hour facility operating in a residential community.

Ms. Dee Piscella, Neighborhood Watch coordinator and a resident of Planters Wood, does not support the day care facility.

Mr. Greg Pearson, resident of Planters Wood, does not support the application for the day care facility to operate twenty-four (24) hours and it violates the covenants.

Ms. Marie Stella, resident of Cove Ridge Terrace in Brandermill, does not support the request.

Mr. Stacy Rogers, resident of Brandermill, supports the day care and stated his son is cared for by Ms. Roberts. While she cares for twelve (12) children, only four (4) cars come to the day care to pick up the kids. There is no traffic issue at her home and the kids play in the backyard, not in the street.

Mr. Hasson Roberts, Ms. Roberts's son supports the day care and feels the Brandermill Community Association has not presented information fairly. He feels this covenant is outdated and the future of the children is at stake.



Ms. Hailey Riley, assistant director of the family daycare home and daughter of Ms. Roberts, stated that there is no traffic problem and they have letters from homeowner's saying there is no traffic problem on this street. She has no issue with covenants but doesn't appreciate the covenants only applying to her mother and no other home based business in Brandermill. Her mother has been State licensed for eighteen (18) years and all she is trying to do is comply with the law.

Mr. Howard Roberts, husband of Joni Roberts said they have been involved with caring for children for many years. They tailor the child care to the child so every child gets the kind of help they need. The covenants in Brandermill are forty (40) years old and need to be updated to reflect the times. Children need to be cared for during off-hours to allow parents to work jobs that demand non-traditional schedules. He asked the Commission for their support for the at home day care.

Ms. Diedra Austin, neighbor of the Roberts', supports Ms. Roberts' day care. She stated there is no traffic problem on her street as a result of the day care. When Ms. Roberts kept Ms. Austin's two boys, she and her husband appreciated the flexibility offered at the Roberts' facility which they could not find at larger day care facilities. She supports Ms. Roberts and requested the Commission's support.

Ms. Mamie McNeal, neighbor of Ms. Roberts, conceptually supports this type of day care but feels there is misunderstanding about how to interpret the covenants.

The applicant, Ms. Joni Roberts explained that her twenty-four (24) hour service is not in place for all of the clients she services. The twenty-four (24) hour service is in place in case one client needs it for overnight shifts and she has not actually cared for an overnight child in two (2) years. Her normal hours of operation are from seven (7) a.m. to six (6) p.m.

In response to a question from Dr. Brown relative to where the children play that are in her care, Ms. Roberts responded they play in the back yard.

There being no one else to speak, Dr. Wallin closed the public hearing.

Dr. Brown stated although he is not a practicing professional statistician, he has significant knowledge in parametric statistics and in survey design and in both areas, this survey is not worthy. The number one (1) requirement is the sample be random and in this case, the sample was self-selected, therefore the results are skewed. The county has no role in enforcing restrictive covenants. The zoning ordinance for Chesterfield County allows several in home activities that are not purely residential to include various home based occupations and home based day care centers. State law requires counties and cities in Virginia to allow home based day care centers with five (5) or fewer children. There are a number of restrictions on most home based occupations that do not apply to home day cares. Because other businesses are in a different class than home day cares, we are not creating precedence for those activities. He is uncomfortable when an entity is inconsistent in applying rules. If you want to restrict a particular activity, it must be enforced for everyone and not just the ones that come to your attention. He supports the applicant in this case.

Mr. Patton stated he is aware of some home day care centers that shut down because they did not want to pursue zoning. He indicated the two (2) issues presented were twenty-four (24) hour operation and two (2) employees. He acknowledged the proposed hours provide a great service, but is not sure how to structure this to be supported by her neighbors. Further, she needs to provide more information about identifying the employees and the role they play in the operation. He has a difficult time depriving someone of their livelihood and he recognizes the value of this service to the

community. Some of the Commission and Board members are strong supporters and proponents of Home Owner Associations and that HOA's add value to the county, but covenants are a civil matter. The discussion this evening is land use when operating a business incidental to a residential establishment. He supports the case.

Mr. Gulley stated he has followed this case closely. These types of cases can be very emotional and bring strong opinions from either side of the issue. Some day cares have been operating for years and it is only with the change in State law that requires proof of appropriate zoning that is bringing them into scrutiny by Home Owners Associations. Typically HOA's do not proactively look for violations, but act on complaints. In this case, when Ms. Roberts had to obtain a conditional use permit; it raised a red flag with her HOA. The county is similar as they act upon received complaints. He was not sure where the implication came from that the applicant was not being treated fairly. He has been on the Commission longer than the other Commissioners, and no applicant has been treated any different than any other applicant and it is not based on race, creed or gender, they are all treated fairly. There are five (5) people on the Commission and each have a vote and that is the fairness of this process. This case is not about Ms. Roberts character, how good a provider she is, her family and how they help her out, her operation in the service she provides, the Brandermill survey or covenants. The covenant and survey are all internal to Brandermill and the Brandermill Board needs to address this issue in governing their community. A few months ago he raised awareness that Virginia ranks in the bottom according to an organization that follows the licensing procedures state by state. The State legislature made a turnaround and enacted laws that governed home day cares regardless of the number of children that are being cared for. Social Services cannot make a change in State law; it has to come from a State legislator. He feels all day cares should be licensed because they will provide more quality care. This case comes down to land use. Many people move into a planned residential community with the expectation the neighborhood has been designated for single-family residential uses. He tries to think about the people that want the single-family residential status to remain and in this case, he feels this operation is approaching a commercial operation. Given the circumstances, he feels that Ms. Roberts would be more successful at providing this service at a commercially zoned location. He struggles with these types of cases but feels that his vote is consistent with past requests. Consequently, he cannot support the case.

In response to a question from Mr. Waller relative to letters by residents that live on Farm Crest Court, Mr. Ryan Ramsey replied that he has received one (1) letter of opposition and nine (9) letters of support and noted that some of these support letters are from residents that live on her street.

In response to a question from Mr. Waller relative to the County supporting the twenty-four (24) hour operation, Mr. Turner and Mr. Ramsey both replied they were not aware of any written correspondence from the County supporting the twenty-four (24) hour operation.

Mr. Waller stated he agreed with Mr. Patton and his concern regarding the twenty-four (24) operation. The number of children cared for, the 24/7 operation and having two (2) employees that reside off-site are troubling to him. If the applicant would offer no off-site employees and standard hours of operation that are consistent with previously approved family day care home requests, he feels that this request would be more acceptable. He does not recall a case where a twenty-four (24) hour family day care home operation was permitted in the past. He cannot support the case as it is currently proffered and feels there is an opportunity to clarify these items before it goes to the Board.

Dr. Wallin stated he is conflicted by this case. This case was generated by a State code change for this type of operation. He noted that this zoning request is a land use issue, not a restrictive covenant issue. The land use issue, the twenty-four (24) hour operation and the two (2) employees complicate

the case and for that reason he cannot support the case as presented. He complimented the applicant for providing a healthy environment for young people.

On motion of Mr. Gulley, seconded by Mr. Waller, the Commission resolved to recommend denial of Case 14SN0517.

AYES: Messrs. Wallin, Gulley and Waller.

NAY: Messrs. Brown and Patton.

### **OTHER DISCUSSION ITEMS.**

Dr. Wallin advised the Commission he would like to share some information about cash proffers and the impact on the capital improvement budget. Since there has been some language changed he requested Ms. Tara McGee enlighten the Commission on these changes.

Ms. Tara McGee stated that the Commission and the public are well aware that cash proffers are generally to be used for capital improvements in the locality capital improvement plan. In 2013, some language was added to the State statute that was specific to schools. In that language, it made clear that cash proffers cannot be used for ordinary maintenance, repairs, or operating expenses for existing school facilities; but they can be used for renovation of existing school facilities if it expands facility capacity. This State law has been followed by Chesterfield County and our cash proffers are used for new construction for schools, roadways and other things. In certain instances, the cash proffers are used for renovations of existing facilities; but only to the extent that those renovations are for expanding the facility capacity.

In response to a question from Mr. Patton, Ms. McGee responded that an email with this information was sent to the Commissioners today.

Dr. Wallin requested that Mr. Turner ask the Budget Management Department to provide the Commission with some information about each of the zoning cases as it pertains to the percentage of the capital improvement plan to be funded by cash proffers. Since there have been questions from the public and from the Commission, he wants to gather information to see how it impacts the capital improvement budget. Each year it assumes the County will collect a certain dollar amount in any given year to complete the CIP budget. It's important for the Commission to know when they are looking at cases individually, whether it be infill, the size of the community, etc., it will help the Commission make better decisions about requests from developers regarding paying no cash proffers. This is just another step in helping the Commission get better information to make decisions.

Mr. Waller stated he thinks Budget Management is probably focused on the immediate monetary shortfalls. He feels the staff reports could better inform the Commissioners about impacts.

Dr. Wallin stated if the Commission is being asked to make judgment calls about cash proffers, they need to understand the impacts to schools, fire, parks etc. when cash proffers are not associated with a case and what impact the lack of proffers have on infill development.

Dr. Brown and Mr. Patton both support Dr. Wallin in asking for this information from Budget Management.

Dr. Wallin requested a letter be sent to the superintendent of schools asking for current information related to functional capacity, current enrollment figures and when at all possible, a representative from schools is at the Planning Commission meetings.

**VIII. CITIZEN COMMENTS ON UNSCHEDULED MATTERS.**

There were no citizen comments on unscheduled matters.

**IX. ADJOURNMENT.**

There being no further business to come before the Commission, it was on motion of Mr. Gulley, seconded by Dr. Brown that the meeting adjourned at 8:22 p.m. to Tuesday, March 18, 2014 at 3:00 p.m., in the Public Meeting Room, 10001 Iron Bridge Road, Chesterfield, Virginia.

---

Chairman/Date

---

Secretary/Date